

(quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See id. at 315–16; Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). “In order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgett, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and Hoyle’s objections. As for those portions of the M&R to which Hoyle made no objection, the court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. As for the objections, Hoyle’s objections restate the claims that she made in her complaint concerning discrimination and harassment. Compare [D.E. 1] 1–4, with [D.E. 7] 2–9. The court agrees with Magistrate Judge Number’s conclusion, allows plaintiff’s retaliation claim to proceed, and dismisses the remainder of the complaint without prejudice [D.E. 6].

In sum, the court OVERRULES plaintiff’s objections to the M&R, GRANTS plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 3], ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 6], ALLOWS plaintiff’s claim of retaliation to proceed, and DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE plaintiff’s remaining claims [D.E. 1]. The clerk is DIRECTED to issue the summons prepared by plaintiff. The U.S. Marshal is DIRECTED to serve the summons and a copy of the complaint on defendant.

SO ORDERED. This 10 day of June, 2024.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge